



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Jh

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,233	08/08/2001	Kerry Bernstein	BUR920010042	9886
5409	7590	05/18/2005	EXAMINER	
ARLEN L. OLSEN SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS 3 LEAR JET LANE SUITE 201 LATHAM, NY 12110			ABRAHAM, ESAW T	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2133		
DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/682,233	BERNSTEIN ET AL.
	Examiner Esaw T. Abraham	Art Unit 2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 2-4, 8, 9, 12-14, 16, 18-20, 24, 25, 28-30, 33-42 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2-4, 8, 9, 12-14, 16, 18-20, 24, 25, 28-30 and 33-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to the applicant's amendments

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/20/05 has been entered.

The amended specification and claims were received on 04/20/05. The specification and the claims are accepted.

Response to the applicants' argument

In response to the applicants' argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicants' invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although, the claims interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read to the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). For example, the applicant argues that the prior arts do not show clocks having high a low periods that do not overlap and the clocks to control whether or not power is supplied to the power rails (as in claims 33-38) and circuit and power rails be on a single integrated circuit (as in claims 36-38) are non-claimed in the claimed.

1. Claims 1, 5-7, 10-11, 15, 17, 21-23, 26, 27, 31 are cancelled, 33-42 are added and claims 2-4, 8, 9, 12-14, 16, 18-20, 25, 28-30, and 32 remain pending.

Note: Claim 24 is not amended or included in the claim lists.

Claim objections

2. Claims 33-38 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a) Claims 33-35 recite, "An integrated circuit". "An integrated circuit" in the preamble. CFR § 1.75 states that the specification must conclude with a claim particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention or discovery. An integrated circuit does not indicate what a subject matter the claims are directed to. The suggests that following --- An integrated circuit for performing a stress testing comprising---
 - b) Claims 36-38 recite, "A method". "A method" in the preamble. CFR § 1.75 states that the specification must conclude with a claim particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention or discovery. A method does not indicate what a subject matter the claims are directed to. The suggests that following --- A method of stressing an integrated circuit, comprising---
 - c) Please change the phrase "clock signal is in a (b) state" ---to--- "clock signal is in a (b) state". (see claim 33 line 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U. S. C 112

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2133

3. Claims 33 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a) Claim 33 recites "said circuit" in line 8. (Note: it is not clear whether "said circuit" refers to "first circuit" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

b) Claims 36-38 recite the limitation "said integrated circuit" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Note: "the said integrated circuit" is unknown or undefined element in claims 36, 37 and 38.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 2133

4. Claims 2-4, 8-9, 12-14, 16, 18-20, 24, 25, 28-30, and 33-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radjassamy (U.S. PN: 6,331,800) in view of Tsukamoto et al. (U.S. PN: 5,930,269).

As per claims 33 and 34:

Radjassamy in figure 3 disclose or teach an integrated circuit comprising a first latch (302) coupled to first clock signal (CK1N) and first logic (304), second latch (306) coupled to second clock signal (CK2N) and second logic (308) for adjusting of clock edge rise/fall times between non-overlapping clock signals and thereby eliminate a race (see col. 1, lines 5-9). Further, Radjassamy teach a method of increasing the rise/fall time of clock edges in an integrated circuit, thereby providing a means for eliminating races, a means for otherwise adjusting non-overlapping clock signal dead times, or a means for adjusting clock pulse widths and the method commences with the identification of a clock signal which has a clock edge with a poor (or inadequate) rise/fall time and when a circuit is simulated the clock edges transmitted in a square wave fashion (see col. 4, lines 1-14). Radjassamy **do not explicitly** show or teach power (rails) applied separately to each of the IC chips wherein each IC chips comprise latches and logic circuits. However, Tsukamoto et al. in figure 4 teach a testing system comprises a burn-in board (11) to be diagnosed, a control signal generator (12) includes clock generator (12a) generates a clock signal CLK, and supplies the clock signal CLK to the burn-in board via scan signal distributor (12b), a power distributor (13) for supplying electric power Vcc to the burn-in board and in figure 5 the burn-in board shows products (IC11/IC12/IC1n, IC21/IC22/IC2n...) of a semiconductor integrated circuit device arranged in rows and columns on the burn-in board, and are electrically connected through contact pins and furthermore Power supply lines VCC1,

Art Unit: 2133

VCC2 and VCCm (power rails) are respectively associated with the columns of products of semiconductor device and the products are powered with power potential Vcc and the ground potential supplied from the associated power supply lines VCC1 to VCCm (see col. 3, lines 55-67 and col. 4, lines 1-22). **Therefore**, it would have been obvious to a person having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Radjassamy to include power supplies for powering clocks and latches as taught by Tsukamoto et al. **This modification** would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated in order to diagnosis the products on the burn-in board without undesirable influence of a partially defective product and automatically classifies the products between the excellent group, the partially defective group an the defective group (see col. 9, lines 48-58).

As per claim 2:

Radjassamy in view of Tsukamoto et al. teach all the subject matter claimed in claims 33 and 34 including Radjassamy in figure 3 disclosed second latch (308) coupled to the second logic (circuit) (306) whereby the second latch and the second logic circuit coupled to the second clock (CK2N). Furthermore, Tsukamoto et al. in figure 5 teach plurality of voltage lines or rails connected to each of the board products (chips) separately (see VCC1, VCC2 ...).

As per claims 3-4, 8-9 and 39:

Radjassamy in view of Tsukamoto et al. teach all the subject matter claimed in claims 33 and 34 including Tsukamoto et al. in figure 5 teach plurality of burn-in products whereby each of the products connected by separate scan clocks (SCN1, SCN2...) and voltage lines (VCC1, VCC2...).

As per claims 12-14, 16 and 35:

Art Unit: 2133

Radjassamy substantially teach or disclose an integrated circuit comprising clocked logic gates a method for increasing the rise/fall of clock edges in an IC commencing with the identification (detecting) of a clock signal with a clock edge having a poor rise/fall time (see abstract and col. 3, lines 34-43). Further, Radjassamy in figure 3, disclose first latch (302) coupled to first clock signal (CK1N) and first logic (304), second latch (306) coupled to second clock signal (CK2N) and second logic (308). Furthermore, Radjassamy teach a method of increasing the rise/fall time of clock edges in an integrated circuit, thereby providing a means for eliminating races, a means for otherwise adjusting non-overlapping clock signal dead times, or a means for adjusting clock pulse widths and the method commences with the identification of a clock signal which has a clock edge with a poor (or inadequate) rise/fall time and when a circuit is simulated the clock edges transmitted in a square wave fashion (see col. 4, lines 1-14).

Radjassamy **do not explicitly** show or teach power (rails) applied separately to each of the IC chips wherein each IC chips comprise latches and logic circuits. However, Tsukamoto et al. in figure 4 teach a testing system comprises a burn-in board (11) to be diagnosed, a control signal generator (12) includes clock generator (12a) generates a clock signal CLK, and supplies the clock signal CLK to the burn-in board via scan signal distributor (12b), a power distributor (13) for supplying electric power Vcc to the burn-in board and in figure 5 the burn-in board shows products (IC11/IC12/IC1n, IC21/IC22/IC2n...) of a semiconductor integrated circuit device arranged in rows and columns on the burn-in board, and are electrically connected through contact pins and furthermore Power supply lines VCC1, VCC2 and VCCm (power rails) are respectively associated with the columns of products of semiconductor device and the products are powered with power potential Vcc and the ground potential supplied from the associated

power supply lines VCC1 to VCCm (see col. 3, lines 55-67 and col. 4, lines 1-22). **Therefore**, it would have been obvious to a person having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Radjassamy to include power supplies for powering clocks and latches as taught by Tsukamoto et al. **This modification** would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated in order to diagnosis the products on the burn-in board without undesirable influence of a partially defective product and automatically classifies the products between the excellent group, the partially defective group an the defective group (see col. 9, lines 48-58).

As per claims 36, 37 and 41:

Radjassamy in view of Tsukamoto et al. teach or disclose all the subject matter claimed in claims 33 and 34, including Radjassamy teach a method of increasing the rise/fall time of clock edges in an integrated circuit, thereby providing a means for eliminating races, a means for otherwise adjusting non-overlapping clock signal dead times, or a means for adjusting clock pulse widths and the method commences with the identification of a clock signal which has a clock edge with a poor (or inadequate) rise/fall time and when a circuit is simulated the clock edges transmitted in a square wave fashion (see col. 4, lines 1-14). Furthermore, Tsukamoto et al. teach a testing system selectively activates products of a semiconductor integrated circuit device mounted on a burn-in board and a power distributor incorporated in the testing system supplies electric power only to the activated products so that non-activated products do not affect the test data signals (see abstract).

As per claims 18-20, 25, 40 and 42:

Radjassamy in view of Tsukamoto et al. teach all the subject matter claimed in claims 36 and 37 including Radjassamy in figure 3 disclosed second latch (308) coupled to the second logic (circuit) (306) whereby the second latch and the second logic circuit coupled to the second clock (CK2N). Furthermore, Tsukamoto et al. in figure 5 teach plurality of voltage lines or rails connected to each of the board products (chips) separately (see VCC1, VCC2..).

As per claims 28-30, 32 and 38:

Radjassamy in view of Tsukamoto et al. teach or disclose all the subject matter claimed in claim 35, including Radjassamy teach a method of increasing the rise/fall time of clock edges in an integrated circuit, thereby providing a means for eliminating races, a means for otherwise adjusting non-overlapping clock signal dead times, or a means for adjusting clock pulse widths and the method commences with the identification of a clock signal which has a clock edge with a poor (or inadequate) rise/fall time and when a circuit is simulated the clock edges transmitted in a square wave fashion (see col. 4, lines 1-14). Furthermore, Tsukamoto et al. teach a testing system selectively activates products of a semiconductor integrated circuit device mounted on a burn-in board and a power distributor incorporated in the testing system supplies electric power only to the activated products so that non-activated products do not affect the test data signals (see abstract).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Esaw Abraham whose telephone number is (571) 272-3812. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are successful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306.

Esaw Abraham

Esaw Abraham

Albert DeCady
ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2106